

SOUTH DAVIS COUNTY TRANSIT DEIS Bountiful Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3 - Summary

Project:

South Davis County Transit DEIS

Meeting Purpose:

Bountiful Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3

Meeting

3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
August 22, 2007

Location:

Bountiful City Hall

Attendee

Angelo Papastamos
Kim Clark
Jacqueline Jensen
Saffron Capson
Colleen Lavery
Robin Hutcheson
Jon Nepstad
Ashley Davis
Carl Kingston
Aric Jensen (representative)
Dorothy Barlow
Clark Jenkins

Representing

UDOT
VIA
H.W. Lochner
H.W. Lochner
Carter & Burgess
Fehr & Peers
Fehr & Peers
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member

Meeting Summary:**Process**

K. Clark began by explaining where the project currently is in the overall process. She indicated alternatives for the project are currently being evaluated. Input from the next round of sub-committee meetings will be used to accomplish this task. During the next regional workshop attendees will focus specifically on alignments. During the current meeting the focus will be on alternative modes. The Purpose and Need Statement for the study was reviewed with the group. Sub-committee members were referred to their meeting packets for full text copies of all of the meeting materials..

Regional Workshop Recap

K. Clark recapped the exercise conducted at the second Regional Workshop which focused on origins/destinations, alignments, and the identification of modes. A map of the primary and secondary alignments identified at the Regional Workshop was shown to the group.

Universe of Alternatives

K. Clark explained what the “universe of alternatives” entailed and the Universe of Alignments map was shown. Sub-committee members were then taken through the two components to an alternative (alignment and mode).

Alignments

A map of preliminary alignments being taken through the alternatives analysis process was shown to sub-committee members as the study’s preliminary “long list alignments.” K. Clark reviewed the criteria used to narrow down alignments.

Modes

Next, a “universe of modes” list was reviewed with the sub-committee members. As with alignment narrowing criteria, mode narrowing criteria was discussed. The preliminary “long list of modes” was outlined by K. Clark. The list was divided into two categories – bus and rail.

Factors to Consider

K. Clark defined factors to consider when comparing modes. Factors included market, capacity, operating characteristics, costs, environmental/community considerations, and access. After each factor was reviewed, a “dot game” exercise was conducted to determine which three factors are most important to each sub-committee member in considering modes. The following is a list of factors identified by the Bountiful sub-committee members as most important when considering modes:

Category	Factors	Number of Dots
Market	Local trips are important.	0
	Commuter trips are important.	4
Capacity		0
Operating Characteristics	It should stop frequently.	0
	It should stop less frequently, and go faster.	1
Costs		0
Environmental/Community Considerations	It needs to sit within the context of my community.	2
	It needs to allow for good traffic flow.	3
Access	It needs to be easy to board.	0
	I need to be able to get to it easily.	5

Long List Modes

R. Hutcheson outlined each mode in the preliminary long list of modes, including giving a description and typical characteristics based on how the mode has been implemented in other communities in the United States. After each mode was discussed, the group participated in an exercise to determine the “pros” and “cons” of implementing each mode in their community. Below is a list of pros and cons identified by Bountiful sub-committee members.

BUS (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Stress-free when there is traffic	Harder to educate about bus service
Local service	Slow
Easy to implement – less expensive	Buses get stuck in traffic
	Not ADA friendly
	Paths are not intuitive (don't know where the lines are going)

BRT – Bus Rapid Transit (2 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Looks like LRT – attractive	Not as permanent as rail – doesn't promote land use change as much as rail
More ADA accessible (if lower floor vehicle)	“Still a bus” stigma
Can maneuver around incidents	Less frequent than local bus

LRT – Light Rail Transit (4 Dots)	
Pro	Con
More ridership	Cost
More inviting	Rail options do not serve local service (causes more transfers)
Permanent – land use investments	Takes road space (right-of-way acquisition)
Ties into existing system	
Off the road – good for traffic problems	

Streetcar (1 Dot)	
Pro	Con
Local trips	Doesn't serve regional traffic (Bountiful to SLC)
Rail – “trendy” (historic is inviting)	Not a cost-effective solution for local service
Can run with traffic or in it's own right-of-way	Impacts traffic flow

DMU – Diesel Mobile Unit (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Speed	Capacity may not be used (with frequency)
Capacity	Air quality impacts
Cost	Poor access
Diesel fuel	Is there enough parking (access)?
	On the west side of I-15 and doesn't serve the east side

Notes: As a pro overall, all modes answer to no parking downtown.

Future Meetings

The next sub-committee meeting will be held on October 17th from 3:00–5:00 p.m.

Any discrepancies with this meeting summary, please notify Jacqueline Jensen.

Cc: Attendees, Project Contact List, Bountiful Sub-Committee Members